



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,079	12/31/2003	Sepehr Fariabi	ACSG-66757 (0970CCC)	1878
24201	7590	07/18/2006	EXAMINER	
FULWIDER PATTON			PREBILIC, PAUL B	
6060 CENTER DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
10TH FLOOR				3738
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045				

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/750,079	FARIABI, SEPEHR	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul B. Prebilic	3738	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 37-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 37-49 and 51-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 50 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 56 and 57 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 20 and 21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,827,734. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 20 and 21 can be read upon by claims 56 and 57 respectively due to the fact that tungsten, iron, and manganese can be 0% or optional as claim 20 is set forth. Since the patented claims can be read on by the copending claims, they are considered to be clearly obvious in view thereof.

Claims 56 and 57 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,419,693. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because patented claim 1 can be read on by present claims 56 and 57 such that it could be said to be "anticipated" thereby. For this reason, the present claims are considered be clearly obvious in view of the patented claims.

Claims 56 and 57 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3 of U.S. Patent No. 5,636,641. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims can be read on by the present claims since the method steps of the patented claims are product-by-process limitations that do not result in a patentable difference. For these reasons, the present claims are considered to be clearly obvious over the patented claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 37 to 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no original support for the new language of claims 37 to 43 that states that the cylindrical elements of the stent can not be elastically compressed to the first low profile delivery configuration without plastic deformation. Upon review of page 7, lines 22-26 and page 8, lines 19-25, the Examiner did not see explicit or implicit support for the new limitation as suggested by the response filed April 27, 2006.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: As an alternative to the previous paragraph, the new language of claim 37 does not have antecedent basis from the specification. Even if Applicant can show that there is implicit support for such language, he would also have to amend the specification to give the language clear antecedent basis as required by 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 37-49, 53, 56-61, 72-74, 78-80, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Robinson et al (US 5,891,193) where the stent of Robinson has a relaxed state where it will not self expand, but it is capable of being bent (permanently deformed) to form the stent; see column 5, lines 31-51. Therefore, the stent is plastically deformable and could be expanded to a state where there would be no bends in the wires; this unbent expanded diameter reads on the "diameter suitable to hold open the coronary artery" as claimed. Particularly, the size of a coronary vessel varies depending upon the particular patient being treated, and thus, the size of the device as claimed is met by Robinson's device which is also balloon expandable to an unbent form of the segments (33). The unbent form and the other forms thereof are the size of some individuals.

Furthermore, the claimed alloy the claimed stent is the same material (MP35N from Carpenter Technology) as that of Robinson's device, which is also MP35N; see Robinson on column 5, lines 34-38 and see the present specification on page 13. For this reason, the claimed alloy composition is fully met.

Additionally, self-expansion depends upon how the device is used and how it is biased. For this reason, the Examiner maintains that the claim language is read on by Robinson's device as it is disclosed.

With regard to the new limitations of claim 37, due to the fact that permanent bends can be put in the wires of Robinson, the Examiner asserts that there is inherently at state of compression that would plastically deform the stent of Robinson since the low

profile configuration has not limit and includes placing a plastically deforming amount of pressure on the stent to compress it.

With regard to claim 42, it was noticed that the range of 0 to 20% iron is being claimed, and thus, Robinson et al meet this limitation because they disclose a 0% iron alloy.

With regard to claim 59, Applicants are directed to Figure 2 of Robinson.

With regard to claims 60 and 61, the aspect ratio claimed is considered to be broad because it is associated with the modifier "about." For this reason and upon inspection of Robinson's figures, the Examiner determined that the claimed aspect ratios claimed are met by Robinson; see Figure 2, which is read on by the present claim language for claim 60 and see Figure 4 for the ratio of two to one.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Robinson et al (US 5,891,193) in view of Hillstead (US 4,856,516) or Tower (US 5,217,483). Robinson et al meets the claim language except for the transverse diameter of about 0.003 inches. However, Hillstead (see column 3, lines 43-45) and Tower (see column 2, lines 34-43) both disclose stents constructed of wires having a

diameter (which would be the transverse diameter) of about 0.003 inches. Hence, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to construct the Robinson device with wires of about 0.003 inches for the same reasons that Hillstead and Tower do the same and in order have a low profile for the stent.

Claims 54, 62-71, 75, 76, 81, 82, 84, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Robinson et al (US 5,891,193) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Robinson et al (US 5,891,193) alone.

With regard to claims 54, 62-71, and 75, the electrochemical polishing step is considered to be a product-by-process limitation. Since the degree that this step is performed is not specified, the Examiner posits that it would not result in a product that is different than that disclosed by Robinson; see MPEP 2113, which is incorporated herein by reference. Alternatively, the Examiner asserts that the claimed invention, if different, is only slightly different. For this reason, the claim language is considered to be at least clearly obvious in view of Robinson alone.

With regard to claims 70 and 71, the aspect ratio claimed is considered to be broad because it is associated with the modifier "about." For this reason and upon inspection of Robinson's figures, the Examiner determined that the aspect ratios claimed are met by Robinson.

With regard to claims 68, 69, and 76, the cold working or age hardening step is considered to be a product-by-process limitation. Since the degree that this step is performed is not specified, the Examiner posits that it would not result in a product that is different than that disclosed by Robinson; see MPEP 2113, which is incorporated

herein by reference. Alternatively, the Examiner asserts that the claimed invention, if different, is only slightly different. For this reason, the claim language is considered to be at least clearly obvious in view of Robinson alone.

With regard to claims 84 and 85, the step of cutting voids from a member is considered to be a product-by-process limitation. Since Robinson also discloses a stent with voids therein, the Examiner posits that process of cutting would not result in a product that is different than that disclosed by Robinson; see MPEP 2113, which is incorporated herein by reference. Alternatively, the Examiner asserts that the claimed invention, if different, is only slightly different. For this reason, the claim language is considered to be at least clearly obvious in view of Robinson alone.

Claims 55 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al (US 5,891,193) in view of Bokros (US 4,300,244). Robinson meets or renders obvious the claim language as explained in the rejection of claim 54 above, but fails to disclose the use of a biocompatible coating thereon. However, Bokros teaches that it was known to coat similar cardiovascular implants with biocompatible coating in order to render them more biocompatible; see column 2, lines 16-24. Therefore, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to coat the Robinson device with a biocompatible coating to make it more biocompatible.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 55 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 14, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant traverses the double patenting rejections by arguing that there are features in the present claims that are patentably distinct from those set forth in the patented claims. However, the Examiner asserts that the present claims are not patentably distinct from the patented claims because the patented claims can be read on the present claims. For this reason, they are considered to be clearly obvious in view thereof.

The Applicant also traverses the Robinson rejections by arguing that since Robinson does not disclose deforming the stent in the manner suggested by the claimed functional language that the claim language is not met. This has not been found persuasive because Robinson, as explained by the Examiner, inherently implies that such deformation is necessarily present therein; see the explanation of the rejection. For this reason, the Examiner asserts that the claim language is fully met; see MPEP 2111 that is incorporated herein by reference.

Conclusion

Applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure, including the claims (MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06). Due to the procedure outlined in MPEP 2163.06 for interpreting claims, it is noted that other art may be applicable under 35 USC 102 or 35 USC 103(a) once the aforementioned issue(s) is/are addressed.

Applicant is respectfully requested to provide a list of all copending applications that set forth similar subject matter to the present claims. A copy of such copending claims is respectfully requested in response to this Office action if the application is not stored in image format (i.e. the IFW system) or published.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Paul B. Prebilic whose telephone number is (571) 272-4758. He can normally be reached on 6:30-5:00 M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Paul Prebilic
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3738